For the Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DI	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
JAMSHID S. KASHANNEJAD,	No. C-11-2228 EMC
Plaintiff, v.	ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S FILINGS OF OCTOBER 2 AND 4, 2012
UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, et al.,	(Docket Nos. 152-53)
Defendants.	

Plaintiff has filed two additional unsolicited briefs, dated October 2 and 4, 2012. Having reviewed the briefs and the accompanying submissions, the Court hereby rules as follows.

- 1. To the extent Plaintiff claims once again that he cannot afford a ticket, the Court has already stated that cost is not a matter for the Court. See Docket No. 151 (Order at 1).
- 2. To the extent Plaintiff claims once again that he may not be able to travel to Turkey (to pick up the transportation letter(s)) because of conditions either there or in Iran itself, he has not provided sufficient evidence that such travel is not possible.
- 3. To the extent Plaintiff asks the Court to order Defendants to express an opinion on the applicability of 8 U.S.C. § 1182 to Plaintiff's situation, the request is **DENIED**. This is essentially a rehash of Plaintiff's contention that 8 C.F.R. § 245a.7(u)(2)(ii) is inapplicable to him. The Court has already declined to rule on this issue on multiple occasions. See, e.g., Docket Nos. 50, 53, 63, 84, 88, 114.

	4.	To the extent Plaintiff suggests that Defendants have not adequately complied with
the C	Court's or	der to meet and confer, Plaintiff's request for relief is premature. Plaintiff admits that
Defe	endants ha	we contacted him to meet and confer. That Plaintiff has not been placed in touch with
the appropriate airline representatives already is not surprising given that the Court's order to meet		
and o	confer wa	s just issued on October 2, 2012.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 4, 2012

EDWARD M. CHEN United States District Judge